

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed April 4, 2004, the Examiner noted that claims 1-35 were pending, allowed claim 13, and rejected claims 1-12 and 14-35. Claims 33-35 have been amended and, thus, in view of the forgoing claims 1-35 remain pending for reconsideration which is requested. No new matter has been added. The Examiner's rejections are traversed below.

Interview

A personal interview was conducted with the Examiner the substance of which is discussed below. In the Interview Summary the Examiner noted the change to the specification discussed below and suggested that claims 33-35 be amended to be consistent with claim 1 regarding the inverse URL similarity feature. The Examiner also indicated that the amendment would be subject to further search and consideration.

Rejection under 112, para. 1

On pages 2 and 3 of the Action the Examiner alleged an absence of support in the specification and rejected all claims under 35 U.S.C. section 112, paragraph 1 for failure to provide an enabling disclosure. As discussed with the Examiner in the interview the feature in question is supported particularly on page 36 of the application. The specification has been amended to make the antecedent clearer. Withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Rejection for Obviousness

The Office Action rejects claims 1-12 and 14-35 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over various combinations of Page, Mukai, Kobayakawa, Chong, Mighdoll, Brown, Logue and Kotoba with Page and Kobayakawa being the primary references.

In the interview with the Examiner it was noted that none of the references teach or suggest the link importance be based on an inverse URL similarity and the link relation of the document. The Examiner agreed that the claims that emphasize this feature were allowable over the prior art. Claims 1-32 emphasize this feature and claims 32-35 have been amended to emphasize this feature. It is submitted that the invention of the claims distinguishes over the prior art and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Amendment Entry

The amendments to claims 33-35 conform these claims to claim 1 concerning the issue discussed with the Examiner. As a result, no new issues are raised and entry is therefore proper

and requested.

Conclusion

It is submitted that the claims satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. section 112. It is also submitted that claim 13 continues to be allowable. It is further submitted that the claims are not taught, disclosed or suggested by the prior art. The claims are therefore in a condition suitable for allowance. An early Notice of Allowance is requested.

If any further fees, other than and except for the issue fee, are necessary with respect to this paper, the U.S.P.T.O. is requested to obtain the same from deposit account number 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: _____

8/31/4

By: _____



J. Randall Beckers
Registration No. 30,358

1201 New York Ave, N.W., Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501